



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/593,112	06/13/2000	Theresa M Gosko	M-8811	7080
33438	7590	04/08/2004	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP P.O. BOX 203518 AUSTIN, TX 78720			CHANG, SABRINA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/593,112

Applicant(s)

GOSKO, THERSEA M

Examiner

Sabrina Chang

Art Unit

3625

ML

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment to claims 1, 29 and 30 have been fully considered.

In amending in response to a rejection of claims in an application or patent undergoing reexamination, the applicant or patent owner must clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. (See §§1.135 and 1.136 for time for reply.) [46 FR 29182, May 29, 1981; para. (b) revised, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10, 1997, effective Dec. 1, 1997] CFR 1.111(c).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/3/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In order to be entitled to reconsideration or further examination, the applicant or patent owner must reply to the Office action. The reply by the applicant or patent owner must be reduced to a writing which distinctly and specifically points out the supposed errors in the examiner's action and must reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action. The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. The applicant's or patent owner's reply must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the application or the reexamination proceeding to final action. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. CFR 1.111(b).

Applicant asserts that the combination of King/Geller is not sufficient in overcoming the claims as recited. Applicant's arguments stem only from general conclusions and restatements of the claims as recited. Such arguments are not persuasive. See CFR 1.111(b).

A restatement of the original rejection, with modifications addressing applicant's amendment, is stated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,319,542 in view of the article "Come, and they will build it" (Geller, Scott. June 1999. *Manufacturing Systems*).

King et al. discloses a system that facilitates a user in electronically ordering items from suppliers. Suppliers manage their own supplier master catalog [Figure 1, Element 106]. Customers can maintain access to their own version of the supplier master catalog, a "private catalog" [Col 4, Line 15. Figure 1, Element 110] (presenting a data file, including a catalog, to a purchaser). The Private catalog can reside on a customer's host computer system or on a public network and can be maintained by customers or suppliers [Col 4, Line 31] (presenting includes transmitting the data file to the customer or hosting the data file on a world wide web interface – public network). Customers can store catalog items in their private catalogs such as volume purchase agreements, corporate contract discounts, control items, etc. [Col 4, Line 23] (data file

Art Unit: 3625

includes business rules in a structured data format, data file includes pricing according to predetermined agreements with the manufacturer and the host). Private catalogs are obtained from direct input from the supplier database or are created by the customer [Col 4, Line 27]. Information is transmitted to the customer using Electronic Data Interchange [Col 5, Line 25] (data file is an EDI format). Suppliers can issue separate batch transaction commands modifying unit prices, discounts, payment terms, usage fees, etc. [Col 5, Line 24] (transmitting an action code within the data file denoting product configurations requiring replacement in a procurement system). A customer can order directly from the private catalog, since the source of the catalog item has been pre-approved [Col 5, Line 50] (the data file is configured to be incorporated into a procurement system).

In specific reference to claims 1 and 7, King et al. does not explicitly disclose that the catalog is one of configurable products including at least one of non-commodity products and services.

Geller discloses that configurators "have been around for more than 20 years." Geller discloses the widespread use of different types of configurators in electronic catalogs including:

- Features and options configurators in which the end user selects one option from each feature group attached to the product being configured. The part number associated with the selected option is added to the configured product.
- Rule-based configurators which encompass 1) reading the rules 2) determining the implied dependencies between the rules 3) working forward from inputs towards the goal 4) prompting the user for inputs as needed to continue processing. The configurator's interface typically displays a series of questions, one at a time, in a sequence determined by the engine.
- Object-oriented configurators which are ideal for configuring a system wherein the number of components is potentially large and cannot be known until the end-user is actually doing the configurations as opposed to the time the designer is programming the configurator.
- Constraint-based configurators incorporating object-oriented programming principle known as inheritance. From an end-user perspective, it looks like the

Art Unit: 3625

familiar shopping cart metaphor used on the Internet. The user selects products from a catalog on one side of the screen to a shopping cart on the other. As the products are selected other products in the catalog are highlighted as required or excluded.

Configurators inherently comprise acknowledgement and notification of acceptable/unacceptable product configuration. It is established that configurators are widely known in the art of electronic shopping and catalog deployment. King et al. discloses a system that allows users to download "private" catalogs, direct from the manufacturer, to their client-side computers. It would have been obvious to modify the system of King et al. to allow users to download any type of catalog, with configuring capability – as taught by Geller – or otherwise, in order to facilitate customers in finding the most appropriate product or service [Geller, Pg. 1].

In specific reference to claims 2 and 3 the system of King et al. and Geller does not explicitly provide that:

- The purchaser includes at least one of a customer, a third party acting on behalf of the customer and a supplier
- The manufacturer includes a third party acting on behalf of the manufacturer

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow any number of parties to participate in the system of King/Geller. The specific party acting, whether the customer, manufacturer or a representative thereof would have been recognized by the skilled artisan as being one of numerous parties suitable for conducting business within the system. The applicant has not persuasively demonstrated that the specific party is anything more than one of the numerous ones that a skilled artisan would have found suitable for the purpose taught by King/Geller. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow any number of parties, generally taught as supplier or customer in the system of King/Geller, to participate in the distributed catalog system. Further it is inherent that

Art Unit: 3625

the private catalog is accessed at the customer's computer (configuration of products independent of a third party provided configuration tool – the catalog is provided directly from the manufacturer and accessed at the customer's computer without third-party intervention).

In specific reference to claims 8, 9, 14, 16 –20, the system of King et al. and Geller does not explicitly provide for a catalog that:

- Includes manipulable parameters that enable configuration of non-commodity products or services, where manipulable parameters include upgrades, downgrades and swapping of components
- Includes non-manipulable parameters that contribute to the configuration of a non-commodity product or service including parent components, orphan components, child components, configuration components and optional components
- Includes a configuration identifier, a price of the configuration, type of components, custom or bundled, upgrades, downgrades and additions permitted with pricing, work flow data identifying add configurations, discontinue configuration, replace configuration, effective data and discontinue data
- Includes at least one of factory-installed components, non-factory installed components, and subsystem configurations – where factory installed, non-factory installed, customer kit and solution data includes the associated Stock Keeping Units (SKUs, including a third parties or a manufacturer generated SKUs and pricing
- Includes a core configuration including commodity and non-commodity default services and customer-specific integration components – where integration components can include customer specific software, menus, images, asset tag labels, security cables, transportation industry options and transportation services

The type of data being stored by the configurator or catalog is merely descriptive non-functional data – i.e. the type of data is simply related to the type of product being sold with no functional or substantive effect on the system and apparatus (a configuring catalog copied from a manufacturer to a customer). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the above-mentioned manipulable parameters, or any parameters for that matter – in relation to a particular product – in the system of King/Geller, for the purpose of assembling a customized product.

Art Unit: 3625

In specific reference to claims 26 and 27, the system of King et al. and Geller does not explicitly provide that the data file is transmitted to the purchaser using an SGML format or a proprietary file format.

King discloses that information is transmitted to the customer using Electronic Data Interchange [Col 5, Line 25] (data file is an EDI format). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide in the system of King/Geller for the transmission of data from the supplier to the customer using any number of formats. The specific format being used, SGML or proprietary file format, would have been recognized by the skilled artisan as being one of numerous means appropriate for electronic data transfer. The applicant has not persuasively demonstrated that the particular methods suggested in the claims are critical or are anything more than one of the numerous methods that a skilled artisan would have found suitable for the purpose taught by King/Geller. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use either SGML or proprietary file format for transfer, similar to EDI used in the system of King/Geller, for the purpose of transferring a customized data file to the customer.

Art Unit: 3625


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabrina Chang whose telephone number is 703 305 4879. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:30 pm Mon.- Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Smith can be reached on 703 308 3588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 1113.

SC


Jeffrey A. Smith
Primary Examiner